arXiv:1403.1991v2 [math.PR] 10 Apr 2014

MIXING OF THE NOISY VOTER MODEL

HARISHCHANDRA RAMADAS

Abstract. We prove that the noisy voter model mixes extremely fast – in time of $O(\log n)$ on any graph with n vertices – for arbitrarily small values of the 'noise parameter'. We then explain why, as a result, this is an example of a spin system that is *always* in the 'high-temperature regime'.

1. Introduction

The *noisy voter model* is a spin system that can serve as a crude stochastic model for the spread of opinions in a human population, or the competition for territory between two species. The model was introduced by Granovsky and Madras [4] as a simple ergodic variant of the extensively-studied *voter model* [7]. Our main result in this paper (Theorem 3.1) is an upper bound on the mixing time of this model: we show that on an arbitrary graph with n vertices, the system mixes extremely fast – in time of $O(\log n)$ – for *all* values of the 'noise parameter', δ.

It is well-known that fast *temporal* mixing is equivalent to a *spatially* 'well-mixed' stationary measure [3]. Corollary 4.2 states that the stationary measure of the noisy voter model on any subset of the integer lattice satisfies a decay-of-correlations condition called *strong spatial mixing*. Conventional spin models such as the Ising model, gas hard-core model and proper coloring model exhibit strong spatial mixing only when they are sufficiently 'disordered', e.g. the Ising model on boxes in $\mathbb{Z}^2$ above the critical temperature. The noisy voter model is thus extremely special, since it can be thought of as *always* being in the high-temperature regime.

2. Preliminaries

2.1. **The Noisy Voter Model.** Starting with a finite simple undirected graph G with vertex set $V(G)$, the state space we consider is the set of all 0-1 configurations on $V(G)$, denoted by $\{0,1\}^{V(G)}$. In other words, at each site $v \in V(G)$, we place a 'spin', which may have value 0 or 1. For $\eta \in \{0,1\}^{V(G)}$ and $v \in V(G)$, we write $\eta(v)$ for the value of the spin at the site v. For $x \in V(G)$, we denote by η^x the configuration obtained from η by flipping the spin at x, leaving all other spins unchanged:

$$\eta^x(v) := \begin{cases} 1-\eta(v) & v = x, \\ \eta(v) & v \neq x. \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

Further, we denote by $d(x)$ the degree of the vertex x and write $y \sim x$ to indicate that the vertices x and y are neighbours.

Definition 2.1. Given a finite graph G and a function

$$c : V(G) \times \{0,1\}^{V(G)} \to [0,\infty),$$

University of Washington, Seattle, USA. Contact: ramadas.math.washington.edu.

a *spin system* is a continuous-time Markov chain on the state space $\{0,1\}^{V(G)}$ with transition-rate matrix $q(\cdot,\cdot)$, where

$$q(\eta,\eta') = \begin{cases} c(x,\eta) & \text{if } \eta' = \eta^x \text{ for some } x \in V(G), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

for all configurations $\eta, \eta' \in \{0,1\}^{V(G)}$ such that $\eta \neq \eta'$.

The *voter model*, introduced in the 70s, is an extremely well-understood spin system [7, Chapter V]. It is defined by the transition rates

$$c(x,\eta) = \frac{1}{d(x)} \#\{y : y \sim x, \eta(y) \neq \eta(x)\},$$

i.e., the rate of flipping the spin at x while in state η is proportional to the number of neighbours of x with spin differing from that at x.

We imagine a 'voter' located at each vertex x and that the spin at x corresponds to its 'opinion', either 0 or 1. Another interpretation of the voter model is a situation where two species, denoted by 0 and 1, compete for territory.

Intuitively, we imagine independent rate-1 Poisson clocks located at each vertex $v \in V(G)$ (i.e., clocks that ring after independent Exp(1) waiting times). If the clock at vertex x rings, the voter at x picks one of its neighbours uniformly at random, and modifies its own opinion to match that of the chosen neighbour.

We observe, however, that the voter model is *not* ergodic, since the all-0 and all-1 states (denoted $\underline{0}$ and $\underline{1}$ respectively) are absorbing. There are hence multiple invariant measures: $\delta_{\underline{0}}$, $\delta_{\underline{1}}$ and all their convex combinations.

The model we study in this paper is a simple ergodic variant of the voter model – the **noisy voter model**, introduced by Granovsky and Madras in 1995 [4].

Definition 2.2. Let $\delta > 0$. The *noisy voter model* is a spin system on a graph G with transition rates

$$c(x,\eta) = \frac{1}{2\delta+1}\left[\frac{1}{d(x)}\#\{y : y \sim x, \eta(y) \neq \eta(x)\} + \delta\right], \tag{2}$$

where $d(x)$ is the degree of the vertex x.

The factor $\frac{1}{2\delta+1}$ in (2) 'normalises' the system so that we have the following intuitive description of the dynamics: assign independent rate-1 Poisson clocks to each vertex $v \in V(G)$. Every time a clock rings at a vertex v, erase $\eta(v)$ and set

- $\eta(v) = 0$ with probability $\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\left[\frac{1}{d(v)}\#\{y : y \sim x, \eta(y) = 0\} + \delta\right]$,
- $\eta(v) = 1$ with probability $\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\left[\frac{1}{d(v)}\#\{y : y \sim x, \eta(y) = 1\} + \delta\right]$.

The parameter δ is called the 'noise' for obvious reasons, and we assume that it is strictly positive. (The case $\delta = 0$ is just the regular voter model, which, as explained above, is not ergodic.)

Remark 2.3. We mention briefly that this is not the most general form of the noisy voter model – we could alternatively have *two* positive parameters δ and β so that the noise in the model causes the system to preferentially tend towards spin 0 or spin 1. In this case, the flip rates can be written as follows:

$$c(x,\eta) = \frac{1}{\delta+\beta+1}\left[\frac{1}{d(x)}\#\{y : y \sim x, \eta(y) \neq \eta(x)\} + \delta\mathbf{1}_{\eta(x)=0} + \beta\mathbf{1}_{\eta(x)=1}\right].$$

However, for the sake of simplicity of the proof, we choose to restrict ourselves to a single noise parameter, δ; it can be easily verified that the proof goes through even in the more general case.

2.2. **Mixing Time.** We first formally define the intuitive notion of 'distance to equilibrium' for an ergodic finite-state Markov chain, or more generally, the distance between two probability measures on a finite set.

Definition 2.4. For any two probability measures μ_1 and μ_2 on a finite set S, the *total variation distance* between μ_1 and μ_2 is defined to be

$$\|\mu_1 - \mu_2\| := \max_{A \subseteq S} |\mu_1(A) - \mu_2(A)|. \tag{3}$$

We define next the notion of the mixing time of a Markov Chain (as a function of ϵ), the minimum time it takes to get to within a total variation distance of ϵ to stationarity:

Definition 2.5. For $0 < \epsilon < 1$, the (total variation) *mixing time* of an ergodic continuous-time Markov chain $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ on a finite state space S with stationary distribution μ is defined to be

$$t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) := \inf\{t \geq 0 : \max_{x \in S} \|\mathbb{P}_x(X_t \in \cdot) - \mu\| \leq \epsilon\}.$$

For two random variables X and Y with values in the same state space, we write $\|X - Y\|$ for the total variation distance between their distributions.

Definition 2.6. We say that a (continuous-time) spin system has *optimal temporal mixing* if there exist constants C, $c > 0$ such that the dynamics on any finite graph G has the following property: for any two copies $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of the chain with possibly different initial configurations, we have

$$\|X_t - Y_t\| \leq Cne^{-ct}, \tag{4}$$

where, as mentioned above, the left hand side refers to the total variation distance between the distributions of the $\{0,1\}^{V(G)}$-valued random variables X_t and Y_t, and $n = |V(G)|$, the number of vertices in G.

Remark 2.7. We observe that optimal temporal mixing is equivalent to a mixing time of $O\left(\log\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$:

- Assume first that optimal temporal mixing holds, i.e., for two instances $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of the dynamics, $\|X_t - Y_t\| \leq Cne^{-ct}$. We further assume that $Y_0 \overset{d}{=} \mu$, where μ is the equilibrium measure of the dynamics. Hence $Y_t \overset{d}{=} \mu$ for all $t \geq 0$. We thus obtain $\|X_t - \mu\| \leq Cne^{-ct}$. Now, suppose $t = \frac{1}{c}\log\left(\frac{nC}{\epsilon}\right) = O\left(\log\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon}\right)\right)$. Then, clearly $\|X_t - \mu\| \leq \epsilon$.
- Conversely, assume that $t_{\text{mix}}(\epsilon) \leq C\log\left(\frac{n}{\epsilon}\right)$, and let $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ and $(Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be two instances of the dynamics. Then, for all $t > 0$, $t = C\log\left(\frac{2n}{\epsilon}\right)$ implies $\|X_t - \mu\| \leq \frac{\epsilon}{2}$. But $t = C\log\left(\frac{2n}{\epsilon}\right) \Leftrightarrow \epsilon = 2ne^{-t/C}$. Hence, for all $t > 0$,
$$\|X_t - Y_t\| \leq \|X_t - \mu\| + \|Y_t - \mu\| < \frac{\epsilon}{2} + \frac{\epsilon}{2} = \epsilon = 2ne^{-t/C},$$
i.e., optimal temporal mixing holds.

Throughout the rest of this article, we keep the parameter ϵ fixed.

3. Main Result: Optimal Temporal Mixing

Theorem 3.1. *For any $\delta > 0$, the noisy voter model on any finite graph G with n vertices has mixing time of $O(\log n)$.*

Proof. A standard method for obtaining an upper bound on the total variation distance between the distributions of two random variables X and Y is to construct a suitable coupling (X, Y), and to use the well-known inequality,

$$\|X - Y\| \leq \mathbb{P}(X \neq Y), \tag{5}$$

which holds for *any* coupling (X, Y) of X and Y (see, e.g. [9, Proposition 4.7]).

Further, if $(X_t, Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a coupled spin system defined on a finite graph G, then for a fixed time t, a simple union bound yields

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{P}(X_t \neq Y_t) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{v\in V(G)} \{X_t(v) \neq Y_t(v)\}\right) \\ &\leq \sum_{v\in V(G)} \mathbb{P}(X_t(v) \neq Y_t(v)) \\ &\leq n\left(\max_{v\in V(G)} \mathbb{P}\left(X_t(v) \neq Y_t(v)\right)\right).\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

Hence, from (4), (5) and (6), it is enough to show that there exists a coupling $(X_t, Y_t)_{t\geq 0}$ such that for arbitrary starting configurations X_0 and Y_0, the following holds for all $t \geq 0$:

$$\max_{v\in V(G)} \mathbb{P}\left(X_t(v) \neq Y_t(v)\right) \leq Ce^{-ct}, \tag{7}$$

where C and c are fixed constants independent of G.

The Coupling: Since the noisy voter model is a monotone system, it suffices to consider a coupling (X_t, Y_t) of the system, with $X_0 = \underline{0}$ and $Y_0 = \underline{1}$. Place independent rate-1 Poisson clocks at each vertex $v \in V(G)$. When the clock at v rings:

- With probability $\frac{\delta}{2\delta+1}$, set both $X_t(v), Y_t(v) = 0$.
- With probability $\frac{\delta}{2\delta+1}$, set both $X_t(v), Y_t(v) = 1$.
- With probability $\frac{1}{2\delta+1}$, pick a neighbour u of v uniformly at random. Set $X_t(v) = X_t(u)$ and $Y_t(v) = Y_t(u)$.

It is easy to see that both X_t and Y_t follow the dynamics of the noisy voter model, defined in (2).

Let $Z_t(v) := \mathbf{1}_{\{X_t(v)\neq Y_t(v)\}}$ be the *disagreement process*, i.e., the indicator of the event that the processes starting from the $\underline{0}$ and $\underline{1}$ configurations (X_t and Y_t respectively) disagree at vertex v at some time $t \geq 0$. Obviously, $Z_0(v) = 1$ for all $v \in V(G)$.

We hence wish to show that

$$\max_{v\in V(G)} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_t(v) = 1\right) \leq Ce^{-ct}. \tag{8}$$

With this coupling, every time the Poisson clock at vertex v rings, with probability at least $\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}$, both X_t and Y_t are updated at v *with the same value* (0 or 1). Hence, independent of its current value, $Z_t(v)$ is set to 0. With probability $\frac{1}{2\delta+1}$, the vertex v chooses a neighbour u uniformly at random. Independent of the current value of $Z_t(v)$, it is clear that if $Z_t(u) = 1$, then $Z_t(v)$ becomes 1 whereas if $Z_t(u) = 0$, then $Z_t(v)$ becomes 0.

Since $V(G)$ is a finite set, $(Z_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is just a continuous-time Markov chain on the (finite) state space $\{0,1\}^{V(G)}$ with initial state $\underline{1}$. We denote the corresponding transition function $p_t(\cdot,\cdot)$ and transition-rate matrix $q(\cdot,\cdot)$. As before, for $\eta \in \{0,1\}^{V(G)}$, denote by η^v the configuration with the value at v flipped, and everywhere else the same as η. We can hence write a formula for the transition rates similar to the noisy voter model (2):

$$q(\eta, \eta^v) = \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=1\}} + \frac{1}{2\delta+1}\cdot\frac{1}{d(v)}\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}}.$$

Interchanging η and η^v, we get

$$q(\eta^v,\eta)=\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=0\}}+\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\cdot\frac{1}{d(v)}\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=\eta(v)\}}.$$

Since $q(\eta,\eta')=0$ if η and η' differ at more than one site and since for any Markov chain $\sum_y q(x,y)=0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}q(\eta,\eta)&=-\sum_{v\in V(G)}q(\eta,\eta^v)\\&=-\sum_{v\in V(G)}\left(\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\mathbf{1}_{\eta(v)=1}+\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\cdot\frac{1}{d(v)}\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

We can now write the forward Kolmogorov equation (see, e.g. [8, Equation 2.17]) for the Markov chain (Z_t), started at $\underline{1}$:

(9)
$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}p_t(\underline{1},\eta)=\sum_{v\in V(G)}[p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\cdot q(\eta^v,\eta)]+p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\cdot q(\eta,\eta)\\&=\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v\in V(G)}p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=0\}}+\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v\in V(G)}\left(\frac{1}{d(v)}\cdot p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=\eta(v)\}}\right)\\&-\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v\in V(G)}p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=1\}}-\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v\in V(G)}\left(\frac{1}{d(v)}\cdot p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, for $x\in V(G)$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1)=\frac{d}{dt}\sum_{\eta\in\{0,1\}^{V(G)}}p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}}.\tag{10}$$

Substituting (9) in (10) above, with the convention that sums indexed with v and η run over all vertices and all configurations respectively,

(11)
$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1)\\&=\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v,\eta}\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=0,\eta(x)=1\}}-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=1,\eta(x)=1\}}\right)\\&+\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v,\eta}\frac{1}{d(v)}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}}\cdot\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=\eta(v)\}}-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}}\right).\end{aligned}$$

For each of the sums over v in (11) above, we consider the cases $v=x$ and $v\neq x$ separately to get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1)\\&=\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\sum_{\eta}\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^x)\cdot 0-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}}\right)\\&+\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\sum_{v:v\neq x}\sum_{\eta}\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta^v(v)=1,\eta^v(x)=1\}}-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(v)=1,\eta(x)=1\}}\right)\\&+\frac{1}{2\delta+1}\Bigg\{\sum_{\eta}\frac{1}{d(x)}\cdot\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}}\cdot\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^x)\sum_{u:u\sim x}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=1\}}-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\sum_{u:u\sim x}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=0\}}\right)\\&+\sum_{v:v\neq x}\frac{1}{d(v)}\sum_{\eta}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}}\cdot\left(p_t(\underline{1},\eta^v)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=\eta(v)\}}-p_t(\underline{1},\eta)\sum_{u:u\sim v}\mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}}\right)\Bigg\}.\end{aligned}$$

In the second term on the right hand side, the sum over η is clearly zero. Since in the second term in the braces $\{\ldots\}$, $v \neq x$, it can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{v:v\neq x} \frac{1}{d(v)} \sum_{\eta} \Bigg(p_t(\underline{1}, \eta^v) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta^v(x)=1\}} \sum_{u:u\sim v} \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta^v(u)\neq\eta^v(v)\}} \\ - p_t(\underline{1}, \eta) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}} \sum_{u:u\sim v} \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)\neq\eta(v)\}} \Bigg),$$

and as before, the sum over η equals zero. We are hence left with

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1) \\ &= \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} \sum_{\eta} \left(-p_t(\underline{1}, \eta) \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}} \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\delta+1} \sum_{\eta} \frac{1}{d(x)} \cdot \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(x)=1\}} \cdot \left(p_t(\underline{1}, \eta^x) \sum_{u:u\sim x} \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=1\}} - p_t(\underline{1}, \eta) \sum_{u:u\sim x} \mathbf{1}_{\{\eta(u)=0\}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

We finally write the transition function elements and indicator functions in terms of probabilities to get the following 'master equation', valid for all $x \in V(G)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1) &= \frac{-2\delta}{2\delta+1}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1) \\ &- \frac{1}{2\delta+1} \cdot \frac{1}{d(x)} \left(\sum_{u:u\sim x} \mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=1, Z_t(u)=0) \right) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\delta+1} \cdot \frac{1}{d(x)} \left(\sum_{u:u\sim x} \mathbb{P}(Z_t(x)=0, Z_t(u)=1) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

For notational simplicity, we now define

$$M(t) := \max_{1\leq k\leq n} \mathbb{P}\left(Z_t(x_k)=1\right), \tag{13}$$

where $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ are the n vertices of G. Suppose, at some instant $s \geq 0$,

$$M(s) = \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1),$$

for some k with $1 \leq k \leq n$. Then $\mathbb{P}\left(Z_s(x_k)=1\right) \geq \mathbb{P}\left(Z_s(x_l)=1\right)$ for all $l \neq k$, $1 \leq l \leq n$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1, Z_s(x_l)=0) &= \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1) - \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1, Z_s(x_l)=1) \\ &\geq \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_l)=1) - \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1, Z_s(x_l)=1) \\ &= \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=0, Z_s(x_l)=1). \end{aligned}$$

Setting $t=s$ and $x=x_k$ in (12), we see that the magnitude of the second term on the right hand side is greater than that of the third term, since for all neighbours u of x_k,

$$\mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1, Z_s(u)=0) \geq \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=0, Z_s(u)=1).$$

As a result,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x_k)=1)\Big|_{t=s} &\leq -\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}\mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1) \\ &= -\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1}M(s). \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In general, at the instant $t=s$, there might be multiple k ($1 \leq k \leq n$), such that $M(s) = \mathbb{P}(Z_s(x_k)=1)$. However, (14) holds for *every* such k. Furthermore,

$\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x_l) = 1)$ is a differentiable (hence continuous) function of t for each $l = 1, \ldots, n$. Consequently, for all $t \geq 0$, we have the inequality

$$D^+M(t) := \limsup_{h \to 0^+} \frac{M(t+h) - M(t)}{h} \leq -\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} M(t),$$

where $D^+M(t)$ is the *upper right Dini derivative* of M at t. Again, since $\mathbb{P}(Z_t(x_l) = 1)$ is continuous for each l, $M(t)$ is continuous at every $t \geq 0$, and we can use the fundamental theorem of calculus to write

$$M(t) = \frac{d}{dt} \int_0^t M(s) ds = D^+ \left(\int_0^t M(s)\ ds \right).$$

Hence,

$$D^+M(t) + \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} D^+ \left(\int_0^t M(s)\ ds \right) \leq 0.$$

Using the elementary fact that $D^+(f+g) \leq D^+f + D^+g$ for any two functions f and g, we have

$$D^+ \left(M(t) + \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} \int_0^t M(s)\ ds \right) \leq 0,$$

for all $t \geq 0$. The monotonicity theorem for Dini derivatives [10, Appendix I] says that if $D^+f(t) \leq 0$ for all $t \geq 0$, f must be nonincreasing. As a result,

$$M(t) + \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} \int_0^t M(s)\ ds \leq M(0) = 1,$$

and hence,

$$M(t) \leq 1 - \frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} \int_0^t M(s)\ ds$$

for all $t \geq 0$. Finally, applying the Gronwall-Bellman inequality [1], we get

$$M(t) \leq e^{-\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} t},$$

i.e.,

$$\max_{v \in V(G)} \mathbb{P}(Z_t(v) = 1) \leq e^{-\frac{2\delta}{2\delta+1} t}.$$

We thus conclude that optimal temporal mixing holds, or equivalently, by Remark 2.7, that the system mixes in time of $O(\log n)$. □

Remark 3.2. It is generally believed that for any spin system, $O(\log n)$ mixing is indeed 'optimal': by a coupon-collector argument, one imagines that in $o(\log n)$ time, not enough sites are updated for the system to equilibriate. However, it is shown in [5] that this argument can fail, but the authors then prove that any *reversible* spin system with 'local' interactions on a bounded-degree graph with n vertices necessarily has mixing time of $\Omega(\log n)$. Unfortunately, a simple application of Kolmogorov's criterion [6, Chapter 1] shows that the noisy voter model is in general *not* reversible. An exception is the simple case of the 1-dimensional torus, $\mathbb{Z}/n\mathbb{Z}$, for which it is easy to see that the noisy voter model with parameter δ is in fact exactly the same process as the stochastic (ferromagnetic) Ising model with inverse temperature $\beta = \frac{1}{4} \log(1 + \delta^{-1})$.

4. Always Hot: Strong Spatial Mixing

As mentioned in the introduction, it is already well-known that fast temporal mixing is in some sense equivalent to a 'well-mixed' stationary measure. We formalise this below.

Although our main result (optimal temporal mixing) holds for any graph on n vertices, we focus on the special case of 'boxes' in the d-dimensional integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, for some $d \geq 1$. (We do this for simplicity; in general, one could consider any lattice with subexponential growth.) By a (finite) *box* in $\mathbb{Z}^d$, we mean a finite induced subgraph: a finite subset of the vertex set, along with all edges between these vertices inherited from the lattice. (In particular, a box need not be cuboidal.)

For $u, v \in \mathbb{Z}^d$, the *distance* between u and v is defined to be

$$\mathrm{dist}(u, v) := \sum_{i=1}^{d} |u_i - v_i|.$$

The distance between a vertex u and a box G is

$$\mathrm{dist}(u, G) := \min_{v \in V(G)} \mathrm{dist}(u, v).$$

For a box $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$, we define its *boundary* to be the set of vertices not in G that are neighbours with at least one vertex in G. A configuration $\tau \in \{0,1\}^{\partial G}$ is said to be a *boundary condition* for the spin system dynamics on the box G, if we run the dynamics on $G \cup \partial G$ conditioned on the spins at the boundary being frozen at their initial values.

Finally, for a finite box $H \subseteq G \subset \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a boundary condition $\tau \in \{0,1\}^{\partial G}$, we define $\mu_G^\tau|_H$ to be the stationary distribution for the dynamics run on G with boundary condition τ, *projected onto* $\{0,1\}^{V(H)}$.

Dyer, Sinclair, Vigoda and Weitz give in [3] an elegant combinatorial proof of the fact that if a spin system has optimal temporal mixing, then the stationary distribution satisfies a condition called strong spatial mixing, which we define below.

Definition 4.1. A spin system has strong spatial mixing if there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that for any finite box $G \subseteq \mathbb{Z}^d$ and a box $H \subseteq G$, any site $u \in \partial G$ and any pair of boundary conditions τ and τ^u that differ only at u,

$$\|\mu_G^\tau|_H - \mu_G^{\tau^u}|_H\| \leq C|V(H)| \exp\left(-c \cdot \mathrm{dist}(u, H)\right) \tag{15}$$

holds.

Due to [3, Theorem 2.3], we hence immediately have the following corollary of Theorem 3.1:

Corollary 4.2. *The noisy voter model has strong spatial mixing for* all *values of the noise parameter δ.*

For other spin systems like the Ising model (with zero magnetic field), proper coloring model and gas hard-core model, strong spatial mixing can be shown to hold only in certain ranges of the parameter space: in the Ising model, the temperature must be high enough; in the proper coloring model, the number of colours should be large enough; and in the gas hard-core model, the fugacity must be low enough. We hence see that the noisy voter model is extremely special, since it can be thought of as *always* being in the high-temperature, highly disordered regime.

Remark 4.3. We also mention that the noisy voter model, when defined on the entire lattice $\mathbb{Z}^d$, is ergodic for *all* $\delta > 0$, an easy consequence of Dobrushin's '$M < \epsilon$' criterion [2]. This in particular means that the noisy voter model always has a unique infinite-volume invariant measure, again in contrast to other spin

systems like the Ising model with zero magnetic field ($d \geq 2$): there exists a unique infinite-volume Gibbs measure only above the critical temperature.

Acknowledgements

This paper contains work done while writing my Master's thesis at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität and Technische Universität München, supported by the Elitenetzwerk Bayern. I thank my supervisor, Nina Gantert (TU München) for suggesting this topic, for the many enlightening discussions and for having taught me so much.

References

[1] Richard Bellman, *The stability of solutions of linear differential equations*. Duke Math. J. 10 (4), 643-647, 1943.

[2] R. L. Dobrushin, *Markov Processes with a Large Number of Locally Interacting Components: Existence of a Limit Process and Its Ergodicity*, Probl. Peredachi Inf., 7:2 (1971), 70-87. (In Russian. See instead [8, Section 4.2] for an explanation in English of the $M < \epsilon$ criterion.)

[3] Martin Dyer, Alistair Sinclair, Eric Vigoda and Dror Weitz, *Mixing in Time and Space for Lattice Spin Systems: A Combinatorial View*. Randomization and Approximation Techniques in Computer Science, 6th International Workshop, RANDOM 2002.

[4] Boris L. Granovsky and Neal Madras, *The Noisy Voter Model*. Stochastic Processes and their Applications, Volume 55, Issue 1, 23-43, January 1995.

[5] Thomas P. Hayes and Alistair Sinclair, *A general lower bound for mixing of single-site dynamics on graphs*. Annals of Applied Probability, Volume 17, Number 3 (2007), 931-952.

[6] Frank Kelly, *Reversibility and Stochastic Networks*. Wiley, 1979.

[7] Thomas M. Liggett, *Interacting Particle Systems*. Springer, 2005 Reprint (Classics in Mathematics).

[8] Thomas M. Liggett, *Continuous Time Markov Processes: An Introduction*. AMS, 2010.

[9] David A. Levin, Yuval Peres, Elizabeth L. Wilmer, *Markov Chains and Mixing Times*. AMS, 2008.

[10] Rouche, Nicolas, P. Habets, and M. LaLoy, *Stability Theory by Liapunov's Direct Method*. Springer, 1977.